

areas, whether it is defense or health care whatever it might be, let's figure out what the right amount is for that area. Then let's look for a system that allows us to collect that in a straightforward, easy to comply with, fair basis. I don't think our current Tax Code meets any of those criteria.

I have made a living for a long time helping people comply with the complexity of it. You know, a lot of my colleagues are in the same boat. But this current system is unworkable, and it leads us down the wrong path.

As you have mentioned, we are now under 1,400 days away from the largest tax increase America has ever seen with the expiration of the current tax rate and the current tax schemes as it relates to the death tax.

We don't know if those are the right ones or not, but they are the ones we have got. The ones we have had in place since 2001, I think, in no small part have contributed to the growth of this economy, have contributed to taxpayers being able to have more of their own money, to put that investment back into their families, businesses and other things. The current tax rates are working, and to the extent that they expire and have automatic increases is unfortunate.

I understand we are about out of time. I appreciate getting to join you late in the hour.

Mr. SHUSTER. We certainly appreciate you coming here over the past several weeks. It is always good to have a CPA on the floor to be able to correct us when we spout off a number that is not quite accurate. You have been able to do that a number of times with us. We appreciate it.

I just want to point out again to people that may be watching tonight, such as a CPA, a small business owner. I was a small business owner. We all have children. Your children, I know, are grown now.

Mr. CONAWAY. Grandchildren.

Mr. SHUSTER. But it is important in America that small business owners and families are not burdened with these heavy taxes. We have to keep them low.

I think the gentleman from Kentucky might have a final passing word.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. I want to thank everybody for joining us. For those of you who are regulars and are corresponding with us, we appreciate your joining us and contacting us at countdowncrew@mail.house.gov.

We believe that the key is not raising taxes; it is creating taxpayers to project economic growth and opportunity for the future. Our backbone is of small business owners that have created the jobs, created the vision, have created the innovation that have helped make this country great. We want to continue standing by you and the working families of America.

With that, Mr. Speaker, we yield back the balance of our time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ARCURI). The Chair would remind Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

THE ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. MICHAUD) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days with which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject matter of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHAUD. At this time, I know the gentleman from Wisconsin has another meeting he has to attend, so I would recognize the Congressman STEVE KAGEN from Wisconsin.

Mr. KAGEN. Thank you very much, Congressman MICHAUD. I certainly appreciate being with you this evening, especially after an enlightening hour of finding out that really they weren't borrowing and spending money.

But, indeed, this is the class of 2006. We were elected to take a positive change in a new direction. We are not the party of borrow and spend and borrow and spend. Because as you all know, the first two letters of borrow and spend are B and S. We are here this evening to talk with you about our trade policies. Indeed, our foreign trade with China has become entirely a negative number.

In this brief slide, the 2006 trade deficit will show you that the United States is losing. We have lost \$233 billion a year in 2006. In the first 2001 numbers, \$83 billion deficit has mushroomed to \$233 billion.

In 2006, China ranked as the fourth largest export market for the United States and the second largest import market. They are our trading partner. We have had the American century, and now we are moving into what will become the Chinese century. But we should be ordered in the rule of law, and unfortunately for us here in the United States, we suffer because they are not following all of the laws.

In a recent article in The New York Times, it reads in part that the Chinese's real advantage results from subsidies. They include government grants for modernization, low-cost loans, debt forgiveness, tax breaks for export or businesses and subsidies for suppliers of wood and pulp, something we are keenly aware of in Wisconsin, in my district, which used to be known as Paper Valley.

According to government data available from the Chinese government

themselves, more than 70,000 illegal seizures occurred of private property, of land in 2004. In 2003, the Chinese admit that 168,000 occurrences of seizures took place.

□ 2045

Well, this is what happens in a Communist country, and it is to their advantage.

The subsidies: According to our own U.S. Trade Representative, "The Chinese subsidies at issue are widely available and offer significant benefits, particularly through income and value added tax breaks. They make it harder for U.S. products to compete with Chinese products, not only in the U.S. and Chinese markets but in any market in the world. They accomplish this by providing a competitive advantage to a wide range of Chinese exports, including, for example, various steel products, wood products, such as hardwood, plywood and paper products, and by providing incentives for Chinese firms to purchase domestic products instead of those from the United States."

United States' manufacturers and exporters are suffering because there is another trade partner of ours that is not following the rules. Indeed, 15 to 20 percent of all products made in China are counterfeit materials. They need to follow the rules.

On this slide is a measure of their unfair trade. There are three things primarily that China is not complying with: currency manipulation, their yuan is below where market prices would bear the price; illegal subsidies; and illegal grants, grants given to companies that have no intention of paying them back. And what can we do about this? We really need balance in our trade deals. We don't need free trade; we need fair trade.

How do we fix an unfair trade deal? We need new leadership in the administration. We need a President and an administration that is interested in fair trade. And what must we do? We must establish fair trade and export our values, not our jobs. After all, if we don't make anything in America, we simply won't have anything.

Mr. MICHAUD. Thank you very much, Congressman KAGEN. This has definitely been enlightening. I really appreciate all the charts that you have. And you are absolutely right, the American people want the new direction for this country and are very pleased particularly with the freshman class, yourself leading the charge to make sure that we do have fair trade agreements. I want to thank you for your time coming to the floor this evening to talk about this very important issue.

I would now like to recognize another freshman Member of the 110th Congress class, the gentleman from Illinois who has taken a real leadership role as well on trade, but also on veterans affairs issues where he replaced a former colleague in this body, Lane Evans, who has been a mentor and has been a leader also on veterans' issues. I would like

to yield to Congressman HARE of Illinois.

Mr. HARE. Thank you, Mr. MICHAUD. And I want to thank you for your leadership on this whole issue of trade. I was here last week, as you know, and we were talking about the Employee Free Choice Act. And I spoke then as a former labor organizer about the difficulties working men and women have in being able to join the union. Tonight I am here, and I want to tell a brief story, if I could, about what I think this whole trade situation boils down to.

In my district, we have a city called Galesburg, Illinois. It was the home of Maytag, manufacturing washers, driers and refrigerators; 1,600 very talented men and women worked in that factory. On two different occasions, the workers of that plant gave pay concessions back to keep that plant open. The State of Illinois, my home State, gave Maytag \$24 million in State taxes for renovations to keep the factory there. The plant, about 8 months later, announced that it was moving to Sonora, Mexico.

The CEO said it was because of several things, but the bottom line was they could make more money manufacturing in Sonora, Mexico, for cheap labor. And 1,600 of those people are out of work, and 1,000 more recently followed a few weeks later in Herron, Illinois, from another Maytag facility. And the CEO of that corporation said, "You just have to understand, Congressman, I am in the business to make money for my shareholders. I don't really care about the people of this city and the educational system and what happens to them, and the small businesses that feed into Maytag. I am here to make money."

Well, I am here tonight to say a couple of things on this whole issue of trade. First, let me say, I said this on the campaign trail, Congressman. I am a card-carrying capitalist; I believe in trade. We have to have trade. I am not a protectionist, an isolationist. But I do know this. As my colleague, Representative KAGEN, said, we have to have some fair trade.

Under this NAFTA agreement, it was tough enough to lose those jobs, but we negotiated that; we, meaning our trade folks, negotiated a 5-year head start for those Maytag jobs in Mexico, gave the Mexican government a 5-year head start on refrigerator products. Now, how are you going to compete?

I went to an editorial board, and I remember saying to the publisher of the newspaper, if your competitor across the river had a 5-year head start on subscriptions and advertising and being able to get the news out each and every day, and you could not publish for 5 years, do you think you would be at a distinct disadvantage? He said, "Absolutely."

So here is what I think we need to do, in plain and simple language from a former clothing worker: I think we have to stop this exportation of manu-

facturing jobs across this country. And we have to be not just angry about it; we have to say: I am more than angry. I am now going to do something that we haven't done before. I am going to raise my voice and I am going to tell my elected Members of the Congress of the United States that if you vote to send our jobs overseas, we are going to vote to send you back to your district permanently, because in this business, we are supposed to be here to represent people.

The job of a Member of the United States Congress, to me, is standing up for ordinary people, and I am tired of seeing our jobs shipped overseas. And, more importantly, the American people hopefully watching and listening tonight are tired of their tax dollars being spent to subsidize those jobs being sent to Sonora, Mexico, where, by the way, the people down there have no trade unions, don't have enough money to even purchase the products that they are making. And I believe that all of us, whether you are a Republican or Democrat or Independent, have seen the hemorrhaging.

In textile, in my industry, thousands of jobs are gone, not because people couldn't do it, but because they can't compete against 18 cents an hour. It is impossible. Not simply because these people were getting benefits and other things that they desperately needed so they can do like I did and buy a home and put their kids through school and go to college and do the right thing; these are veterans of our country who have fought and defended it. They come back and had a job that was taken away from them, not because of anything they did wrong.

So here is what I propose: How about a little corporate responsibility? But how about, let's tell our trade negotiators that we want trade, but let's make it fair and free? Let us don't negotiate our manufacturing jobs overseas. And, by the way, let me just say, I have a lot of agriculture in my district, and farmers are the last group brought to bear on the trade negotiations. They are never brought to the table. I think we have to have, as Representative KAGEN said, an administration and a Congress that says to the trade negotiators, look, we want trade; we want to be able to negotiate a decent standard of trade for our folks. But we will not do it by simply abdicating our manufacturing base, whether it is in steel or textile or automobiles, whatever it is, because there are hundreds of thousands of people in this country, and not every one of them is going to sit behind a computer terminal the rest of their life and work. They want to be welders. They want to produce steel. They want to produce automobiles. They want to cut men's suits like I am wearing tonight that, by the way, was made in Chicago, Illinois, by working men and women.

So I would just encourage everybody this evening as we have this debate on trade that, from my perspective, I ran

on this issue, and I am going to be a Congressman on this issue. I am not going to vote for a trade deal that is going to send one more job overseas. I am not going to vote for a trade deal that abdicates the responsibility, and to go back to my district and as some people say, well, you know, we are in a global economy. It is high tech. Well, I understand I am in a global economy. I wasn't born yesterday. But I also know, to those men and women from Maytag that don't know what they are going to do for their health care now that it is gone, for health care, their pensions that are on the line that they are losing, those people from KSIH that lost their jobs simply because they happen to be a union plan and maybe made a bit too much money; I say to those folks that, today, this Congress needs to stand up for working men and women. It needs to say we want trade in this country. We will work very hard to make sure that we have the ability to export our products, but at the same time, the one product that we are no longer going to export in this country is the men and women and their futures and their children, because there is no place for that in fair and free trade.

With that, I just want to thank the gentleman for allowing me to speak this evening for a few moments on this issue. I believe very deeply in this. The great news about being a freshman is sometimes we don't come with the best prepared speeches. I think we speak a lot from the heart. But I can tell you this much, from a former clothing perspective, in our union, there is a movie called, "The Inheritance," that talks about how the union was formed. And at the very end of it, a little old man looks into the end, and I would say to our friends on the other side of the aisle who don't want to work with us on this straight policy, he says, "You think this is the end? My friend, this is only the beginning."

This 1-hour tonight is the beginning of changing trade policy in this country and in this Chamber. And I am honored to be part of it.

Mr. MICHAUD. I thank you, Representative HARE, for your leadership role in this as well.

If I understand your comments correctly, you are not against trade deals, but you want to make sure that they are fair trade deals. And I really appreciate your perspective. But especially just coming off of a campaign, being a freshman Member working up in your State of Illinois, you know what is going on.

I think, all too often, once people get here in Washington, D.C., they tend to forget what is really happening in reality. And reality is, we have lost over 3 million jobs nationwide because of our unfair trade deals, and we have got to bring equity back in that. So I really appreciate your leadership in that role and look forward to working with you as we move forward to make sure that we do have fair trade deals here in this Congress.

It is now my great pleasure to introduce another freshman Member who has also taken a leadership role, from Iowa, Congressman BRUCE BRALEY.

Mr. BRALEY. I would like to thank my friend from Maine, and also my friend from Illinois who happened to bring up the issue with the Maytag jobs. And I think this leads us to another topic that is not discussed very often in terms of some of the hidden costs of our current trade policy.

The former world headquarters for Maytag was located in Newton, Iowa. And I grew up about 30 minutes from Newton, Iowa. I got my first driver's license at the Jasper County Courthouse in Newton, Iowa. Over 150 years ago, my great, great grandfather, George Washington Braley, walked from up in your neck of the woods from Vermont all the way to Iowa and settled in Jasper County. And Maytag has been a foundation of the economy in Jasper County for many, many years, and Mr. HARE talked about the plant in Illinois, the Maytag plant that lost many of its jobs to Mexico.

What happened about 10 years ago was, in an effort to develop competition between competing Maytag factories for the Neptune washers, it was decided that there were going to be incentives offered by the State of Iowa and the State of Illinois in the competition to keep those jobs in America. And so the legislature in Illinois and the legislature in Iowa both went to work to pass special tax statuses for expensing of manufacturing equipment to make it more attractive for those companies in Iowa and Illinois to be able to compete for these new Neptune washers.

Unfortunately, as we have seen, that competition was short-term only. And the Maytag headquarters no longer exists in Newton, Iowa. The Maytag jobs in Illinois have now left for Mexico. And we are seeing the impact that this trade policy that we have pursued for the past decade is having on American workers.

And, like my friend from Illinois, nobody I talk to, my friends in labor, my friends in small businesses and manufacturing, thinks that trade is a bad thing. We need to encourage trade, because that is what creates job opportunities for American workers. What we are talking about is making sure that our trade policies are fair and balanced. And one of the unique things that I have seen since I came here is that we seem to see more and more small- and medium-sized manufacturers and labor coming together and talking about a need for a comprehensive reform of our trade policies.

One of the things we know is that the Constitution gave this body, Congress, an important role to play in international trade, and one of the problems with the fast-track trade promotion authority that previous Congresses gave to the chief executive was that, in a sense, it involved an abdication of our responsibilities to be an active

partner in setting trade policies. And what that means is that we have also abdicated some of our responsibilities to the workers of this country, to the workers of international countries where trade laws and workers rights are not held to the same high standards they are in the United States. We have penalized American manufacturers because of environmental regulations they are required to comply with in this country that are not imposed upon foreign manufacturers. And we have seen the exploitation of workers and human rights in other countries that allow goods to be produced at slave labor conditions and severely undercut the market for those goods on the international economy.

□ 2100

So I am here tonight with my friends to talk about why it is important that, when we go forward from this point, looking at the trade policies, not just for the current administration, but for future administrations, no matter which party happens to occupy the White House, it is important for us to look back on the historical role that Congress has played in making sure that our trade policies reflect the same basic values that made this country great in the first place. And so that is why I am here to talk about how we, as a body, have to step up to the plate and share our fair share of this responsibility moving forward.

And to my friend from Maine, where I know these policies have had a dramatic impact in a lot of different manufacturing and foreign good sectors, I would like to yield back and ask about some of the difficulties that his constituents have encountered in this same area.

Mr. MICHAUD. Well, I thank the gentleman for his discussion on this issue. You brought up a very good point. You had mentioned fast track. And I think what a lot of people don't realize is the fact that fast track only allows Congress two options, to vote "yes" or "no." We have no options to amend this trade deal. We just have to vote "yes" or "no." And we are abdicating our responsibilities by allowing fast track to occur, which hopefully, with a new Congress and a new direction, when we look at trade deals, we will be able to change fast track so that we can have an opportunity to make sure that we do have fair trade deals.

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Would the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MICHAUD. I yield.

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Were you serving in this body when fast track was authorized?

Mr. MICHAUD. No, I was not. I was serving in the Maine legislature, and I was opposed to it then. I am opposed to it now, especially when you see what damage fast track has caused to this Nation, what it has caused to our manufacturing. Maine alone, over the last 6 years or so, we lost 23 percent of our manufacturing base alone in the State

of Maine. Certain labor market areas had unemployment rates over 30 percent. It has really devastated the State of Maine because of these unfair trade deals, and it is all related to the unfair trade deals.

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. We know from history that timber has always played an important role in the economy of your State. How has the timber industry been affected because of what is happening in the global marketplace for timber and lumber sources from other areas that don't have to comply with the same types of restrictions we talked about earlier?

Mr. MICHAUD. As far as industries in the State of Maine, timber, the paper industry have definitely been devastated the most when you look at trade deals. We just actually had a few weeks ago Moosehead Manufacturing which closed its doors because of the imports from China. So it has had a negative impact primarily in the paper and in the timber industries.

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. One the things that we often don't talk about when we talk about the loss of jobs overseas is the direct impact it has on the communities where those jobs depart from. And one of the things that we know, in talking about the sad story of Maytag in Iowa, is that at the time Maytag still functioned with its corporate headquarters in Newton, Iowa. They contributed almost \$1 million a year just in property taxes alone to the city of Newton and Jasper County. That is just one small component of the many intangibles that we don't talk about with these trade policies and how they impact the communities that we represent over the long term.

One of the other things we know is that a lot of people who work in those good-paying jobs take on leadership roles in their communities as volunteers, as coaches, as mentors; and when they have to leave because they don't have a place to work anymore, all of that intangible benefit that contributes to the quality of life in a community leaves with them. So I think that sometimes we focus too much on the pure economic costs of these jobs that go overseas, and not enough on the real human costs that goes along with them.

Mr. MICHAUD. You are absolutely right. As a matter of fact, when you look at what is happening, a lot of municipalities, their primary business has been hit because of unfair trade deals. It has that rippling effect to other businesses within the community, but also the family structure. When you look at the fact that when Mills filed bankruptcy, and I have seen it in my own town, the divorce rate actually goes up. The alcoholism goes up, and you are losing that structure, and that is why we have to make sure that we do have fair trade deals.

As we heard earlier today from Congressman HARE, he is not against trade deals. He just wants to make sure that they are fair trade deals. And that is

what we have to do as a Congress is to make sure that we do have fair trade deals.

I am very pleased to see that a lot of Members, new Members of Congress who have just come off the campaign trail, when they were campaigning, they were talking to their constituents, and they heard a lot about loss of manufacturing here in this country because of the trade deals. So I am very pleased to see that we have such a large group of freshmen Members on the floor this evening to talk about trade deals and what they are doing to this country, or what they are doing to their individual districts.

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. I think a good example of that was one of the first things I did after becoming a Member of Congress was look at caucuses I could join that were going to be beneficial to the constituents that I represent in my district. One of the caucuses I joined was the Steel Caucus because there is a steel plant that has a direct economic benefit to employees in my district.

And one of the things I was struck by at the meeting that I went to, a breakfast meeting of the Steel Caucus, was it was bipartisan. There were representatives of the steel industry, of labor, and everybody was there to talk about the same problem, and that was cheap steel from China flooding the U.S. and international markets.

And one of the things that came up during those discussions, again in a bipartisan sense, was the myth of the so-called level playing field, which is that U.S. manufacturers who play by the rules, provide good, high-paying jobs with decent benefits, comply with environmental regulations, treat their workers fairly, are not on a level playing field when it comes to competing with Chinese competition and other parts of the world economy because other countries do not play by the same rules.

So I think one of the things that we need to be talking about here is how we can work in a bipartisan spirit to develop those coalitions that have a direct benefit for American workers, American manufacturers, American employers and consumers of these products, because we all are literally in this together.

Mr. MICHAUD. You are absolutely right. And actually speaking about in it together, we have been joined by another freshman Member from Pennsylvania, freshmen Member JASON ALTMIRE, who has also taken an interest and a leading role in the whole trade deal. I would like to yield to Mr. ALTMIRE for his comments.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I would like to thank the gentleman from Maine for his leadership on this issue. This is a critical issue.

And you mentioned a lot of us are freshmen, like the gentleman from Iowa, who are just coming off the campaign trail from a few months back. And I come from a district in western Pennsylvania, just north of Pittsburgh, and I have six counties going along,

three of them go along the Ohio line, and the other ones go just north of Pittsburgh. And I would think you would be hard pressed to find a district in this country that has seen more damage done by the global marketplace than Pittsburgh over the past 30 or 40 years, and more recently over the past dozen or 15 years since NAFTA was passed in 1993.

And just for some historical perspective for what I am going to talk about, and I know you have mentioned it already, the country as a whole lost three million manufacturing jobs since NAFTA was agreed to in 1993. And that is one out of every six manufacturing jobs that existed in this country at that time. I don't think we can draw any other conclusion but that that was not beneficial to this country and had the effect of job loss. I mean, it is self-evident.

Now, manufacturing jobs are disappearing in Pennsylvania as well. We can trace about 100,000 jobs lost in Pennsylvania as a direct result of NAFTA. And of course when you get into indirect result, that number is much higher.

Now, there has been a loss of 210,000 manufacturing jobs total, 24 percent decrease in the State of Pennsylvania over just the past 6 years. That is total. That is not just NAFTA. That is all these trade agreements. So we have lost a quarter of our manufacturing jobs in just the past 6 years.

Now, in my district just last week, this has unfortunate significance that just last week we lost 85 workers from Wheatland Tube, a large manufacturing plant in my district; 85 workers were released on February 26. And this is just the latest in a series of downsizing that has taken place there.

And I would put in a mention of Congressman TIM RYAN from Youngstown, who is very involved in this issue as well. And he came over to Wheatland Tube with me during the campaign, and we met with some of the workers and the leadership there at that time, and they expressed their concerns about China and their inability to compete in a fair way with what is happening in China. And here we see only a few months later that 85 workers have now lost their jobs as a result of what is happening.

And I would mention this quote from the vice president from Wheatland Tube last week. He said, "We are not seeing relief from Chinese imports, and we are not going to sit around and wait for that relief. We need to right-size the company." And this is just one example.

Again, I have six counties in western Pennsylvania, and we are seeing this certainly all over the district and all over western Pennsylvania. But right there at Wheatland Tube, unfortunately, it hit home just last week.

Now, the onslaught of foreign subsidized goods that are illegally dumped in the U.S. is just one of the many problems that we are seeing that has not been addressed by this administration. And certainly these trade agree-

ments are doing nothing about this. And the administration that has put forward CAFTA and some of the other more recent trade agreements continues down the same path.

And I can tell you that, with the possible exception of health care, there was no issue over the 18 months I spent on the campaign trail that came up more often and was of greater concern than these trade agreements in western Pennsylvania. So the American people have spoken on this issue. I can tell you, for sure, they spoke in my district, and I know they spoke in Mr. BRALEY's district. And we are going to hear from Congresswoman SUTTON later and Mr. ELLISON as well.

I think this is an issue whose time has come. It cannot be ignored any longer. These trade agreements have been detrimental to America. And none of us are saying we should bury our heads in the sand and ignore the global marketplace. What we are saying, as Mr. HARE eloquently put it earlier, is that we need to have trade agreements that represent fair trade. And fair trade means having the trading partner make some effort, at least an effort, to come into compliance with environmental laws, with workers' rights, certainly child labor laws. These are things that have been completely left out of these trade agreements. So we find ourselves just giving away the store and shipping those jobs overseas, as Dr. KAGEN's chart so eloquently illustrated.

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ALTMIRE. I would.

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. I know the gentleman from Pennsylvania has a fondness for college football so I am going to root this question in that. One of the great football players at Iowa State University when I attended there in the mid-to-late 70s was a gentleman named Tom Perticone from Clareton, Pennsylvania. And while Tom was playing football at Iowa State, the movie "Deer Hunter" was very popular, which was filmed in and around Pittsburgh general area, and also near Clareton. And one of the things that film depicted so well was the whole culture of the community where a life's history has been devoted to a particular industry and how everything revolves around it. And we have seen that in my home community of Waterloo, Iowa, near the old Rath Packing Company, where a virtual community of businesses and services formed around the factory, and everyone's lives were tied up in that.

And I was hoping that you might be able to shed some light on the very real, personal toll on the culture of those communities in your district that have seen this dramatic shift, and how employment is available to the people who graduate from high school and don't have the same opportunities they did 15 years ago.

Mr. ALTMIRE. Well, in a word, it has been devastating, and we have seen the results. I talked about Wheatland Tube. I grew up about 100 miles from that plant, in a river town that was across from a big Allegheny Ludlum plant, which is where all the families worked. If you lived in that town, that is where you worked. And, unfortunately, things have not gone so well over the past couple of decades, both at that plant and another Allegheny Ludlum plant that I have in my district, and much of it has to do with these foreign trade issues. And as a result, now, when you travel through these communities, they used to be so vibrant and had a downtown that you could go through and it was hustle and bustle and there was activity. A lot of them now are ghost towns because we have seen the impact and the job loss that has resulted from the downfall of the steel industry 20 and 30 years ago, but more recently, the other heavy manufacturing that has been shipped overseas.

□ 2115

So it has been devastating to these communities, and you would only need to take one drive through much of my district to see the impact, because you can see the remnants of some of those plants. In many cases, they have been razed, and it is a brownfield site. But you can see the difference, and you can imagine what it used to be like 30 and 40 years ago and, in many cases, more recently.

I was just going to wrap up my portion by talking about what is coming next before us. And, again, none of us oppose the idea of trade. Fair trade is beneficial to both parties by definition. That is what we are talking about. But as the administration puts forward the Peruvian Trade Agreement, Colombia, Panama, and certainly fast track renewal, which the gentleman from Maine was talking about, we need to consider the fact that Congress, Representatives of the people, need to play an active role in these trade agreements. And, unfortunately, that has not been the case, which is why we have ended up with such one-sided agreement. So, as we consider those issues with Peru and Colombia and Panama and Presidential fast-track authority, I for one am going to support the working Americans of this country for fair trade practices.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

I really appreciate your willingness to come to the floor this evening. I know you care deeply about this issue, where it has affected your district dramatically, and your willingness to speak up for the working men and women and businesses here in this country to make sure that they have a fair shake at these trade deals. So thank you for your leadership. I look forward to working with you as we move forward to deal with these issues.

Now I would like to recognize a gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON),

who is also a member of the freshmen class, but he brings a uniqueness from the State of Minnesota as far as the effect that these unfair trade deals have had on the State of Minnesota and the businesses and the working people within Minnesota.

I yield to the Representative from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the Member from Maine for his excellent leadership, looking out for the hard-working people of this whole United States.

It is true, I am honored to come from the Fifth Congressional District of Minnesota, but as I stand before you tonight, Mr. Speaker, I am honored to associate myself with the Member from Maine, with the Member from Ohio and Pennsylvania, because working people all over America need a fair trade and balanced trade situation. We can no longer abide doing trade deals which essentially support environmental policies that degrade other nations, that degrade workers in other nations, and that degrade human rights in other nations, and then thereby give other nations a competitive advantage over us because of the exploitation and ignoring important environmental regulations. And it is all very important because we need leadership tonight, Mr. Speaker, leadership which is willing to stand up and be counted for the American people, leadership which will not go with the wind but will actually change the wind. That is the leadership we need at this time.

Let me say that we need a trade policy that does three things, basically: respects workers' rights and their dignity; protects our fragile environment; and upholds basic human rights. Today's trade policies in America do only a few of those things but very little of what we need.

What we see is a continual erosion at the very heart of America: the middle class. It started first with the elimination of our manufacturing jobs. And I now represent Minnesota, the Fifth District of Minnesota, but I started life out in Detroit, where I saw plants closing on a daily, weekly basis, and I saw jobs outsourced on a weekly basis. But now what we see is a situation in Minnesota where that has taken hold and we see jobs leaving left, right and center, and it has got to stop.

The global economy has evolved to a large extent and is reminiscent today of the Robber Baron era, where huge transnational companies scour the planet for the cheapest, most exploitable labor and the most lax environmental standards. We have the opportunity to change that in Congress, and we must change it.

But what kind of global economy do we want? The answer to that question must be determined and will be determined to a large extent by the rules incorporated in free trade agreements that define so much of the global economy. By what we decide in this Chamber, we will determine the shape of the global economy.

If we want sweatshops in the global economy and the continued erosion of our middle class, we could continue negotiating and passing trade deals with no protection for workers or the environment. Trade deals that threaten the prevailing wage laws. Trade deals that could force us to privatize public services.

But if we truly believe in a global economy that lifts the living standards at home and around the globe, one that seriously values the environment on which all life depends, then what we must do is we must do better. If we want a better global economy that lifts standards everywhere, we need to change our approach to trade agreements as we enter into this fast-track arena coming up.

First, we need to put an end to the fast-track trade negotiating procedure which previous Congresses have ceded to the Executive branch. The Founding Fathers wisely delegated that role exclusively to the branch of government closest to the people: the Congress. And we have the perfect opportunity to take back our constitutional responsibility by allowing fast-track promotion authority to expire in June. We can and will put forward a different, more humane method of negotiating international trade agreements, but it is time for fast track to die a rightful death.

Secondly, we must stop passing more trade deals designed to spread the sweatshop model of the global economy. It has become clear that NAFTA, after 13 years of real-life experience, has not worked. It has cost us a million manufacturing jobs, left Mexican workers without rights and still working for wages far below the Mexican poverty level. It has displaced more than 1.5 million Mexican farm families, leaving many with no alternative but to migrate north for a better life.

The same applies to CAFTA and the pending Peru and Colombia "free" trade agreements. Colombia is distinguished by being a country where trade unionists are assassinated more than in any other nation in the world.

Instead, we can construct a new global economy built on generosity and inclusivity; one that raises living standards and supports the vast and growing global middle class. But we can only do it by casting off the failed policies of recent decades and by building the middle class.

The choice is ours. The choice is clear. It is time to reclaim Congress's free trade authority and our country's, and the world's future.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota.

And we will work closely with you as we move forward to make sure that what trade deals we do pass in this Congress are fair trade deals. I want to thank you very much for your leadership and interest in this area.

Mr. ELLISON. Fair trade.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I now would like to yield to an individual

who is also a member of the freshmen class but an individual who definitely has done a yeoman's job in dealing with this trade issue. She knows the trade issues inside out. She has been a leader. She has organized the freshmen class to send a letter to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. RANGEL, because of the concerns about trade.

And, Ms. SUTTON, I want to really thank you from the bottom of my heart for what you bring to this whole debate as we debate the trade deals, and I look forward to working with you over this Congress to move forward to make sure we have fair trade deals.

So, Mr. Speaker, I now yield to Ms. SUTTON.

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for those kind remarks and for yielding.

I thank you also not just for your leadership on behalf of the Members here, but I thank you for your leadership on this issue for the people that I represent, the good and fine folks of Northeast Ohio, from Lorraine to Akron to Barberton. This is so meaningful and so important, what we are doing here tonight and what we need to do, this Congress, to ensure that they have a better chance in this world.

It is crystal clear, not just from the discussion tonight but from what we see when we go home to our districts and we look across America, that our trade policies are not benefiting America's workers and America's businesses as they should. And there is a lot of angst and anger out there. People are really concerned.

The trade policies don't work for the average folks, but they also don't work, and I have to emphasize this, for American businesses as they should.

Working families in my congressional district in the State of Ohio and our Nation continue to face mounting job losses and a tumultuous economy. We have heard the numbers before, but they bear repeating.

Since 2000, we have lost 3 million manufacturing jobs nationally. And, unfortunately, 200,000 of those jobs have been from my home State of Ohio.

Now, it is clear that Congress needs to act. When things aren't working, we should change direction. And that is why I am so proud of these new Members whom we have had the opportunity to hear from today and the leadership that they are exhibiting to take this Congress and this country into a direction that will work for the American people. We can't stand idly by and watch our jobs go overseas and our families suffer at home and our trade deficits soar.

I want to point out that I, like so many of the others who have spoken before, feel it is very important to say I am not opposed to trade. You know, sometimes when we start having discussions like this, people try to pit you into one category or another. They like to say you are either for trade or you are a protectionist.

Well, this is not a question about protectionism versus trade. This is a question about the rules of trade, and this is a question about what rules we think should be in a new trade model that will allow for trade to be engaged in fully and fairly by this country but require that others play by the same rules.

Trade can benefit American businesses and workers, and it can be a tool to help developing countries that are looking to access our markets. I hold out hope, and I hope it bears out, that I will have the opportunity in this Congress to vote for a trade agreement that lifts up our working families at home and abroad; a trade agreement that protects our environment at home and abroad; and a trade agreement that has strong and enforceable provisions, ensuring that all partners are playing by the same rules.

Now, we have heard some discussion about fast track already this evening. And my colleague Representative BRALEY and Congressman MICHAUD, you have identified this as such a critical issue coming up very quickly, set to expire in June. And I can tell you that, on behalf of those I represent in Northeast Ohio, I, for one, will not be supporting its renewal.

Fast track has been a raw deal for many American workers and businesses. Fast track takes away the accountability and oversight that Congress has been given under the Constitution to deal with trade. And, frankly, it has left us in a position with misguided and downright shameful trade policies that we have today.

If we had not had fast track, Congress could have been in a place to play a significant role in shaping the trade agreements while it still might have made a difference. The problem with fast track is, by the time it gets here, all we get to do is say whether we are going to vote "yes" or "no" for what is a bad trade deal.

We need to move in a new direction on trade. It is a moral imperative, and our fight begins with ending fast track. But there are other concerns that we have talked about on the trade horizon, such as the deals with Peru and Colombia and Panama. And these agreements, they have been modeled after the same flawed model that NAFTA gave us. And NAFTA was responsible for 50,000 jobs losses in Ohio. It is no longer hypothetical. We don't have to wonder what is going to happen with NAFTA. NAFTA has been a disaster for the people I represent and for this country.

So while we continue to get these harmful trade agreements forced down our throats, we have failed to address many of the trade problems we face with China and Japan and Korea and others. And while our trade deficits soar to the tune of a record \$800 billion, which I have to tell you is not a record we should be happy with, with these nations, our wages in our Nation stagnate and hundreds of thousands of jobs have been displaced.

What is it about these failed trade policies that those who continue to push them don't understand? This is not acceptable, and we cannot allow this race to the bottom to continue.

□ 2130

I thank the gentleman very much for his leadership. I thank you on behalf of those I represent. I will continue to work with you as much as I possibly can to develop a new trade model, one that will work for American workers and businesses.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady. You are absolutely right, it is these flawed models that continue to come up after the NAFTA model and all these other trade deals. Until you change that flawed model, we are still going to get these bad trade deals continuing.

You mentioned the Colombia Free Trade Agreement. I don't think there is any fix for this agreement. I think it is highly offensive that the Bush administration would even negotiate with a country that is infamous for the highest rate of trade unionist assassinations. More than 2,000 labor union activists have been murdered in Colombia since 1990; 60 assassinated in 2006 alone. I think that is just unconscionable.

I agree with Congressman Sandy Levin when he says that we have to look at these flawed models that are out there. These side agreements that people are talking about, they are not going to work. They don't have the force of law.

I think we definitely have a long ways to go before we have trade deals that I can support. And with the freshman class we currently have under your great, fantastic leadership, I applaud them, and encourage that each and every one of you continue to speak out on this issue, because it is an issue that is important to the American people, it is an issue that is important to our businesses, workers in this country, but it is also an issue that is very important when you look at our security and immigration.

When we heard the NAFTA discussion, when they passed NAFTA, we were encouraged; I was not here, but Members were encouraged to vote for it because it would help with the illegal immigration problem with Mexico. The problem has not been solved. It has gotten worse because the NAFTA agreement has not worked the way it was supposed to work.

So I look forward to working with you and the rest of the freshman class, along with other colleagues who are interested in this trade deal.

Speaking about other colleagues, another gentlelady from Ohio as well, Congresswoman KAPTUR, who has also been a strong leader in the trade debate over the past 5 years that I have been here, and she has been a tremendous advocate for making sure that we have fair trade deals, I see she has some charts up there with a lot of red

ink. I assume that is probably the trade deficit that she is going to talk about.

I yield to the gentlelady.

Ms. KAPTUR. Congressman MICHAUD, Congresswoman SUTTON and Congressman BRALEY, I wanted to come to the floor tonight and say it is so wonderful to have you here in this beloved House, to try to course correct on a direction that the United States has been heading in the wrong direction now for over two decades. And with the new energy that you represent and the new leadership, I have no doubt that when fast track comes up for reauthorization later this year, we are going to stop it dead in its tracks and begin turning our country around again.

I just wanted to run to the floor just for a couple of minutes to put some notes in the RECORD and to say that for 23 years Congress has really doled out to the executive branch our trade-making authority under Article I, section 8.

If you go back to 1975 when fast track was first passed, the United States had trade balances up until then for almost the entirety of our history. Then as you look at each succeeding agreement, whether you go to 1993 and NAFTA, we were already amassing trade deficits after the first fast track was passed back in the seventies.

Then when PNTR with China was passed, plus NAFTA, plus all the other agreements that were signed, we moved into the most historic deficits represented by the lost jobs that Congresswoman SUTTON talked about, that Congressman BRALEY talked about, Congressman MICHAUD you talked about and personally lived through.

So we have seen real wages stagnant with those jobs lost. We have seen our jobs move overseas to the lowest-wage countries in the world, the most undemocratic. We have seen child labor flourish. We have seen bonded labor come back into our country as a result. We have global warming taking hold as our environmental regulations are really overturned under agreements like NAFTA. Illegal immigrants stream across our borders because they are treated like they have no value in their home countries. Our trade deficit continues to soar, and the drug trade locks in heavily.

So I wanted to come down tonight and present some of these figures and say that there is a pattern to history now. You are like the second wave. You are coming in here. Those of us who fought so hard against NAFTA in 1993, those of us who tried so hard to course-correct, we never had the votes. Unfortunately, it was so close; it was so very close. But people hadn't lived the wash-out. You now represent places that have experienced the results of this.

So we look forward to this coming vote this summer. It is such a joy to have you here, and I just wanted to thank you for your really determined leadership and for the people who voted you here so that you could come to Washington and make a difference. We

so very, very much need your voices here.

When Fast Track expires at the end of June this year, Congress can reclaim our authority granted by Article 1 Section 8 of the Constitution "to regulate commerce with foreign nations." For 23 years, Congress and the working class watched the executive branch commandeer U.S. trade policy. We also saw real wages stagnate, American jobs move overseas, child labor flourish, global warming take hold, illegal immigrants stream across our borders, our trade deficit soar, and the drug trade thrive.

Like many of us here, I receive thousands of letters, phone calls, and e-mails from my constituents asking me to take action on these important issues.

While there is no one cause for any of these problems, Congress cannot ignore how U.S. trade policy impacts the full range of issues affecting Americans and the world. Congress must respond to the American people who demand action from us.

Congress has yielded enough power to the executive branch. If we renew Fast Track and continue to cede our Constitutionally-granted authority, we will only render ourselves more helpless in the face of a broken immigration system, economic instability, an environmental crisis, and a burgeoning drug trade.

Our previous trade agreements may not have been the sole causes of these emergencies, but trade policy is the key to solving them.

Congress needs to examine the root causes of our immigration problem and the exploitation of workers across the Americas. When the leaders of U.S., Mexico, and Canada signed NAFTA 14 years ago, they turned their backs on working men and women across the continent. The agreement continues to chip away at the U.S. economy, leaving millions jobless and accumulating a staggering and growing trade deficit with Mexico, now totaling a record \$64.1 billion for 2006. At the same time, NAFTA ravaged the Mexican economy and destroyed the farming and agricultural sectors. This so-called "free trade" agreement has prompted hundreds of thousands of Mexicans to look for an escape from their worsening destitute circumstances to the U.S., and in doing so they risk their lives, the unity of their families and their futures.

U.S. trade policy upsets more than just our immigration crisis. Our faltering trade policy has also contributed to the global environmental emergency. When the Bush Administration entered into CAFTA, they did so with countries which rarely enforce their already limited environmental policies. Many of my constituents have already contacted me about the devastating environmental consequences of the Peru Free Trade Agreement. How can Congress fight global warming in the U.S. while allowing our trade rivals to destroy the rain forests and retain lax emissions standards? We must use trade as a tool to protect the environment, not to pillage it.

Lopsided flawed trade agreements weaken our economy. Since NAFTA's passage, over one million U.S. jobs were sucked into Mexico. Because of PNTR, more than 1.5 million jobs shipped out to China. After two centuries of trade surpluses, NAFTA ushered in an era of soaring trade deficits, even after proponents promised us bigger surpluses.

More recently, President Bush's trade policy in particular has caused more damage to our

trade accounts. The trade deficit has climbed to record numbers each year since he took office in 2001. From \$362 billion his first year to a whopping \$763.6 billion last year, this President has been selling the U.S. to the highest foreign bidders.

Our constituents are calling Congress to action. Without the authority to regulate commerce with foreign nations, Congress cannot effectively respond to these crises.

Congress must stand for free trade among free people, and ensure that all Americans have access to middle class jobs at middle class wages with health and retirement benefits that cannot be rescinded. We must oppose Fast Track, reclaim our negotiating authority from the executive branch, and answer the pleas of the American people.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, we are headed on a collision course. If you look at our budgetary deficit, we have the largest budgetary deficit in our history. The debt limit was increased to \$9 trillion. We have the largest trade deficit in our history, which continues to rise because of these unfair trade deals. And if Congress does not get a handle on both the budgetary deficit and our trade deficit, we will no longer be the superpower that we are today.

When you look at our budgetary deficit, over 45 percent of that is owned by foreigners, China being one of them. If you look at our trade deficit with China, we saw charts earlier where it is skyrocketing.

When I hear my colleagues talk about the fact that we are going to put trade assistance funding in there so that we can retrain workers, they don't want trade adjustment assistance. They want their jobs. That is very important for them.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further on that point, recently, about a week ago, Hershey Chocolate announced it was going to move its operations out of Pennsylvania to Mexico. They have already been testing those Hershey Kisses, those big ones they are making down there now and the taste has changed. I am thinking, where is the old Hershey bar that used to taste so good?

You look at all the jobs in Pennsylvania associated with all the dairying that goes on and then the processing. They say that they are going to save the tourist center, but it won't be real any more, because the jobs won't be there, both in the plant itself and in the countryside that provides the raw product into Hershey.

So you ask, why are we allowing ourselves to be hollowed out like this? Wall Street is really in a pitched battle with Main Street across this country, and we have to fight here to save those middle-class jobs.

Mr. MICHAUD. Absolutely. Congresswoman SUTTON mentioned earlier the fact this is not just a workers' issue; it is a business issue. The United States Business and Industry Council has been very supportive, very helpful with the Kaptur trade deal. They are going to be very helpful I think when you look at fast track and other areas. So this isn't

just working people issues; it is business issues. A lot of people try to put workers against business. It is not that issue at all. It is these unfair trade deals.

I would like to ask Congresswoman SUTTON a question, if I might. How would you address this issue: We hear all kinds of times the issue, you are a protectionist. What is your response to that?

Ms. SUTTON. Well, again, this is the way those who like what is going on with our trade deals, and those would be more or less the multinational companies who are very involved in helping to push them, whenever we start talking about this and the real impact and the real effects, they like to call you names like protectionist.

That is how they shut the debate down; but we can't allow that to happen, because, again, this is not a question of protectionism versus trade. It is a question about what are the rules of trade going to be.

We just have to keep saying that, because there are going to be voices out there that would like people to believe otherwise. But all we are talking about is what kind of rules of trade do we believe should be engaged in.

Mr. MICHAUD. That is very good. I know we are running out of time. I do want to thank you, Congresswoman SUTTON and Congresswoman KAPTUR, for your leadership in this role, and I really appreciate the hard work that everyone is doing on this issue, especially our freshman class.

As Ms. KAPTUR had mentioned, the freshman class has really come forward and really taken on this issue, taken an interest in this issue, I think primarily because you just came off the campaign trail. You heard what people were talking about out there. It is important for Members who have been here for a while to listen to you as freshman Members because you definitely have a lot to talk about when it comes to this trade issue.

We have seen it firsthand. As I mentioned earlier, I worked at the mill for over 28 years, and I have seen firsthand what NAFTA has done to my town, my community, to individuals who worked in the mill.

So I want to thank each and every one of you for taking an interest in this very important issue.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker: I am proud to join many of my House colleagues today to present a strong voice in opposition to renewing Fast Track trade negotiating authority in any way, shape or form.

Fast Track allows the President to negotiate trade agreements without input from Congress. In addition, Congress is prohibited from amending any trade agreements reached under Fast Track authority.

Cynically repackaged as "trade promotion authority" in 2002, under President Bush's watch, Fast Track has been utilized to unjustifiable ends. Wages are flat, our trade deficit has skyrocketed and good-paying manufacturing jobs have been lost by the thousands.

Increased imports from low-paid workers abroad, combined with threats made to work-

ers by companies to move operations overseas, drive American workers' wages down. Through the 1950s and 1960s, the American middle-class grew and prospered. In 1973, the average U.S. worker made \$16.06 an hour. Today, after adjusting for inflation, that same worker would make only \$16.11 per hour.

In stark contrast to hourly wages, average U.S. worker productivity has nearly doubled over the same period. Clearly, the divide in America between the "haves" and "have-nots" is growing, and the richest few, along with multi-national corporations, are the big winners under our nation's flawed trade policy.

Up until 1973, the U.S. experienced relatively balanced trade, with small trade surpluses being the norm (\$1.9 billion surplus in 1973). Since Fast Track was granted in 1974, the U.S. had a trade surplus in just one year (1975). Now, in 2006, our nation's trade deficit has skyrocketed to over \$760 billion.

Our trade deficit has more than doubled since President Bush took office. For 2001, our trade deficit was \$362 billion. Last year, our trade deficit reached yet another new record high at \$764 billion.

Since WWII, good paying manufacturing jobs have been the driving force behind our nation's robust middle class allowing families to own homes, send their children to college and gain access to quality, affordable healthcare.

Since President Bush took office, the U.S. has lost 3 million manufacturing jobs. Michigan alone has lost 213,000 manufacturing jobs, or about one-quarter of the state's manufacturing jobs.

My record is clear. I voted against the Trade Act of 2002, which mistakenly granted this Administration "trade promotion authority." Now, it is time for Congress to put the brakes on the Bush Administration's failed trade policies and come to our senses to realize the damage done. First, we must not make matters worse. Congress should reject the pending free trade agreements with Peru, Colombia and Panama. My colleagues should not be misled. Fast track trade negotiating authority is not required to negotiate or approve free trade agreements.

Second, we need serious, thoughtful review of our nation's trade policies and their impact on wages, jobs and our trade balance. Pitting American industries against one another, political gamesmanship, and manipulation and sloganeering must come to an end so that Congress and the Administration should get down to business.

The United States is a world leader, and we must enact trade policies that truly encourage positive standards and quality of life for both the United States and our foreign partners. Reject renewal of Fast Track trade negotiation authority, so we can get back to sensible and fair trade policy.

SOLUTIONS TO TRADE PROBLEMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ARCURI). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege to be seated here in this Chamber and listen to the presentation over the last probably hour and a half or so. It is quite interesting as I listened to the presentation made

by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and the concern about the imbalance in trade, which I am concerned about, and the argument that we need not necessarily free trade, but fair trade.

As I carefully listened to the 60-minute presentation, I hear some things that are wrong, and I agree with some of them, as a matter of fact, most of them, but I heard no suggestions on how we are going to fix this, except ask the administration to do it better and get it right.

I think it is important for us, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to identify these issues that we are going to call problems that we should also step forward and have the will and the foresight to present some solutions.

So in the time I have had here to listen now, I will just present some solutions that I would have liked to have heard from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, because I think we ought to be here to fix the problems we have.

First, I don't have quite the same number of trade deficit that the gentlelady from Ohio presented in the poster here just a little bit ago. I recall that 2 years ago, actually now 3 years ago, our trade deficit was a minus \$617.7 billion. Last year it was a minus \$725 billion. Her number was slightly higher than that. We should by now have the records for the 2006 trade deficit. I have not had access to that number, and I note the gentlelady from Ohio didn't present a number for the 2006 trade deficit, but it had been increasing about 20 percent a year for several years.

I heard no evidence that convinces me that NAFTA is the only reason. In fact, I will submit that there are a number of other reasons that we have a trade deficit. I would challenge my colleagues, join with me in some of these solutions that I will present here.

But before I do so, I am just going to go back and review some of the remarks that were made and then respond to them with solutions rather than lamentations, Mr. Speaker.

The gentleman from Wisconsin called for fair trade. He showed a poster that has a minus \$233 billion trade deficit with China. I don't dispute that number. I expect that is as very close, if not as accurate, a number as there is out there. But that is a portion of and not even a majority of our trade deficit that we have from a global imbalance.

Then the gentleman from Illinois made the statement "We need fair trade." Fair trade in fact was called for by I believe every one of the speakers, and at least no one disagreed with that.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I refuse to allow my staff to use the word "fair." In fact, I refused to let my children use the word "fair" as they were growing up, because I know something that most Americans know, and that is anyone who has raised two or more children knows there is no such thing as fair.